

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed November 16, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 11-14 remain in this application, where claims 5 and 8-10 had been canceled without prejudice, claims 6-7 had been withdrawn as being directed to Group III, FIG 5-9, and new claims 11-14 have been added.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1-4 have been amended for non-statutory reasons, such as for better form including beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A' and changing "characterized in that" to --wherein--. Claims 1-4 were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of

Equivalents.

The Office Action indicates that the oath or declaration is defective requiring a new oath or declaration. It is not clear why the oath or declaration is defective, where "material to patentability" is underlined and printed in bold. A review of the Declaration of record indicates that there is no defect, as the filed Declaration specifically recites:

"I acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is material to the examination of this application in accordance with Title 37, Code of Federal Regulation, §1.56." (Emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that information material to examination includes information material to patentability. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Declaration of record is not defective.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over of U.S. Patent No. 4,192,065 (Tietjens) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,390,416 (Uchiyama). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-4 and 11-14 are patentable over Tietjens and Uchiyama for at least the following reasons.

Tietjens is directed to a shaving apparatus having a cutting

member 4 driven relative to a shear plate 2. As clearly shown in FIGs 1 and 5, and specifically recited on column 2, line 37-39, the "cutting member 4 is driven by a drive pin 7 ... driven by the drive spindle 8." (Emphasis added) That is, the drive pin 7 drives the cutting member 4. In turn, the cutting member 4 drives an auxiliary mass, such as a disc 11 shown in FIG 1 or a component 21" with three spheres 19" shown in FIG 5. As shown in FIGs 2-4, coupling members 14, 15 of the cutting member 4, and NOT the drive pin 7, drive a tab 13 of the disc 11, or drive the sphere 19" of the component 21". That is, the drive pin 7 does NOT directly drive the disc 11, or the sphere 19".

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 11, and similarly recited in independent claim 1, amongst other patentable elements recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

a drive shaft which is configured to directly drive the coupling member so that the driving surface of the coupling member drives the driven surface of the inner cutter with a driving force, wherein the driving force is substantially perpendicular to the driving surface and the driven surface and is substantially parallel to the cutting force.

A drive shaft for directly driving a coupling member so that

the coupling member drives the inner cutter is nowhere taught or suggested in Tietjens. Rather, Tietjens disclose that the cutting member 4, and NOT the drive pin 7, drives the disc 11, or the sphere 19". Thus, the Tietjens drive pin 7 does NOT directly drive the disc 11, or the sphere 19"; rather, the Tietjens drive pin 7 directly drives the cutting member 4.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1 and 11 be allowed. Uchiyama is cited to allegedly show other features and does not remedy the deficiencies in Tietjens. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-47 and 12-14 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 11, as well as their individually patentable elements. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

For example, driving and driven surfaces having helical shapes, as recited in claims 3 and 14 are nowhere taught or suggested in Tietjens, Uchiyama and combination thereof.


In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of

Amendment in Reply to Office Action mailed on November 16, 2007

argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
February 11, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101